UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,386	11/15/2001	Joe Nathan Brown	AUS920010875US1	7328

46073 7590 02/07/2007		EXAMINER
IBM CORPORATION (VE)		NGUYEN, MAIKHANH
C/O VOLEL EMILE		
P. O. BOX 162485	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX 78716	2176	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12/01/2006* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-10,12,14-21,23,25-32,34,36-43 and 45* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-10,12,14-21,23,25-32,34,36-43 and 45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the communications: Amendment filed 12/01/2006 to the

original application filed 11/15/2001.

Claims 1, 3-10, 12, 14-21, 23, 25-32, 34, 36-43, and 45 are currently pending in this

application. Claims 2, 11, 13, 22, 24, 33, 35, and 44 have been canceled. Claim 45 has

been added. Claims 1, 12, 23, and 45 are independent claims.

Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claim 1, 3-10, 12, 14-21, 23, 25-32, 34, 36-43, and 45 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C.

102(a) as being anticipated by **DeStefano** (US 6,184,885 - filed 03/16/1998)

As to claim 1, 12, 23, and 34:

DeStefano teaches a method, computer program product, apparatus, and computer system

(e.g., a computer system) of making links *(e.g., links, hyperlinks)* that are not easily

identified in a displayed Web document *(e.g., typically selectively enabled in response to*

a predetermined criteria so that different links may be enabled or disabled under

appropriate circumstances) by a user *(e.g., a user)* to be clearly recognizable *[see the*

discussion beginning at col.3, line 6] comprising the steps of:

- displaying the Web document *(e.g., HTML document)*, the Web document have a

  plurality of embedded links *(e.g., hypertext links) (col. 18, lines 12-28 & see also*

  table 1 and the associated text);

- enabling the user to issue a command to have the plurality of links embedded in

  the Web document to be highlighted; receiving the command upon issuance *(e.g.*

  Links are typically selectively enabled in response to a predetermined criteria so

  that different links may be enabled or disabled under appropriate circumstances.

  For example, a link may be selectively enabled in response to the sensitivity of

  one of the named concepts for the information elements to being crossed over by a

  pointer, or in response to a specified highlight enablement status of one of the

  referenced concepts. A link may also be enabled based upon the highlight

  enablement status of a link type associated with the link, or of a particular level of

abstraction associated with the link; col. 3, lines 24-36 / issues highlight events to

each lens in a len sets that is capable of displaying information elements; col. 25,

lines 1-5 & send a highlighting event to the primary lens and the list of secondary

supplementary lenses ... to highlight the information element; col. 26, lines 28-

37); and

- upon receiving the command, displaying the Web document with all the plurality
  of embedded links highlighted *(e.g., different types and/or combinations of*
  specific links between named concepts may be presented to a user in different
  circumstances, thereby providing alternate presentations of information from a
  body of knowledge to the user ... select which and/or how links between named
  concepts are presented to different types of users; col. 3, lines 37-51; see also
  col. 11, lines 1-43 and col. 18, lines 12-28).

As to claims 3, 14, 25, and 36:

DeStefano teaches the plurality of embedded links flash to highlight the links *(e.g., The*
highlighting may also take any number of forms ... blinking; col. 24, lines 19-28).

As to claims 4, 15, 26, and 37:

DeStefano teaches the plurality of embedded links are displayed in the different color to

highlight the links *(e.g., The highlighting may also take any number of forms ... a display*

characteristic for highlighted information may be modified, e.g., by modifying ... colors;

col. 24, lines 19-28).

As to claims 5, 16, 27, and 38:

DeStefano teaches the plurality of embedded are displayed using a larger font to highlight

the links *(e.g., The highlighting may also take any number of forms ... a display*

characteristic for highlighted information may be modified, e.g., by modifying ... font

size; col. 24, lines 19-28).

As to claim 6, 17, 28, and 39:

Bates teaches the plurality of embedded are displayed using a different font to highlight

the links *(e.g., The highlighting may also take any number of forms ... a display*

characteristic for highlighted information may be modified, e.g., by modifying font type,

font size; col. 24, lines 19-28).

As to claims 7, 18, 29, and 40:

DeStefano teaches the plurality of embedded links are emboldended to highlight the links

(e.g., The highlighting may also take any number of forms to visually distinguish

highlighted information from unhighlighted information ...For example, a display

characteristic for highlighted information may be modified, e.g., by modifying font type,

font size, font attributes, colors, patterns, shading, and/or blinking; col. 24, lines 19-28)

As to claims 8, 19, 30, and 41:

DeStefano teaches the plurality of embedded links are displayed using an enlarged and

the links target area enlarged to highlight the links *(e.g., The highlighting may also take*

any number of forms to visually distinguish highlighted information from unhighlighted

information ...For example, a display characteristic for highlighted information may be

modified, e.g., by modifying font type, font size, font attributes; col. 24, lines 19-28).

As to claims 9, 20, 31, and 42:

DeStefano teaches the plurality of embedded links are duplicated and displayed in a

different area to highlight the links *(e.g., a separate working copy 54 of the body*

knowledge is used by page builder 86 for each lens-filter pair during viewing so that

appropriate links to different types of information 'especially executable methods' may

be maintained; col. 13, lines 42-57).

As to claims 10, 21, 32, and 43:

DeStefano teach when a duplicated link is selected, its corresponding link in the web

document, displayed using a different font *(e.g., The highlighting may also take any*

number of forms to visually distinguish highlighted information from unhighlighted

information ... by modifying font type, font size; col. 24, lines 19-28).

As to claim 45:

The rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, DeStefano

teaches:

- asserting an icon in the browser, the icon being able to toggle on to highlight the

  links and to toggle off to de-highlight the links (e.g., *Each crossover sensitive*

  switch 92 may be toggled on or off to gate whether link pointer highlighting is

  enabled; col. 19, lines 1-26 & also see Fig. 7 and the associated text); and

- enlarging the plurality of links and the target areas upon user command to

  highlighting the plurality of the links (e.g., *visually-distinct highlights may be*

  applied in the alternative so that the link type, level, etc. of a particular linked

  concept ID may be distinguished on the computer display ... The highlighting may

  also take any number of forms to visually distinguish highlighted information

  from unhighlighted information. For example, a display characteristic for

  highlighted information may be modified, e.g., by modifying font type, font size;

  col. 24, lines 10-28).

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed on 12/01/2006 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant argues in substance that *DeStefano does not teach enabling a user to issue a command to have a plurality of links embedded in the Web document to be highlighting, and upon receiving the command, displaying the Web document with all the plurality of embedded links highlighted* [Remarks, pages 13 and 14].

In response, the mapping provided in the rejection above shows how DeStefano meet the claim limitations. DeStefano teaches a user to issue a command to have a plurality of links embedded in the Web document to be highlighting *(e.g. Links are typically selectively enabled in response to a predetermined criteria so that different links may be enabled or disabled under appropriate circumstances. For example, a link may be selectively enabled in response to the sensitivity of one of the named concepts for the information elements to being crossed over by a pointer, or in response to a specified highlight enablement status of one of the referenced concepts. A link may also be enabled based upon the highlight enablement status of a link type associated with the link, or of a particular level of abstraction associated with the link; col. 3, lines 24-36 / issues highlight events to each lens in a len sets that is capable of displaying information elements; col. 25, lines 1-5 & send a highlighting event to the primary lens and the list of secondary supplementary lenses ... to highlight the information element; col. 26, lines 28-37)*, and upon receiving the command, displaying the Web document with all the plurality of embedded links highlighted *(e.g., different types and/or combinations of specific links between named concepts may be presented to a user in different*

circumstances, thereby providing alternate presentations of information from a body of

knowledge to the user... select which and/or how links between named concepts are

presented to different types of users; col. 3, lines 37-51; see also col.11, lines 1-43 and

col.18, lines 12-28).

Conclusion

4.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

- Bates et al.   U.S. Pat. No. 5,987,482   Issued: Nov. 16, 1999
- Bates et al.   U.S. Pat. No. 6,222,541   Issued: Apr. 24, 2001
- Bates et al.   U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0196172 A1   Pub. Date: Oct. 16, 2003

5.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the

extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than

SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can

normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the

examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be

reached at (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is

571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for patents
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Maikhanh Nguyen

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER